
Introduction

This chapter estimates the direct economic impact of visitors to Glacier National Park for four Road rehabilitation alternatives. It measures direct economic impacts in terms of visitor days and expenditures that visitors make in the local impact area and in the remainder of the State of Montana.

This chapter focuses on the potential reduction in visitor activity during construction for the Road rehabilitation alternatives. The post-construction condition of Going-to-the-Sun Road will be generally comparable to the before condition, since the capacity will not be altered in a material way.

The chapter also includes a discussion of the potential impacts due to construction activity itself including payroll and purchases of material and equipment. These construction impacts will be analyzed more specifically and integrated into the analysis of direct and indirect socioeconomic impacts in the forthcoming environmental impact analysis.

The estimates presented in this chapter exclude the potential counterbalancing effect of mitigation actions. The 2000 Survey of Visitors (Chapter 1) clearly shows that offers of other park visit opportunities and alternative ways to view Going-to-the-Sun Road can have a significant mitigating effect. *Chapter 5, Priority Visitor Development Actions*, suggests a number of mitigating actions.

These estimates also exclude any multiplier effect. The multiplier effect will be quantified and analyzed in the forthcoming environmental impact analysis.

These calculations have been developed from several primary sources of information: (a) forecasts of visitors in absence of the Going-to-the-Sun Road rehabilitation alternatives; (b) estimates of visitor days by month, provided by the National Park Service;

(c) estimates of reduced vehicle traffic for each construction management alternative provided by MK Centennial and responses to the 2000 survey of visitors, and; (d) estimates of visitor expenditures, provided by responses to the 2000 survey of visitors.

The text of this chapter outlines the steps taken to prepare these calculations and summarizes the results. Appendix H provides an illustration of the step-by-step calculations.

Road Rehabilitation Alternatives

These alternatives are explained in detail in the *Going-to-the-Sun Road Engineering Study*. They are summarized below for the reader's convenience.

1. Repair as Needed. This alternative provides for operations and maintenance of the Road, at a rate that is generally consistent with the current level of funding, about \$2 million per year. This alternative is a close approximation to historic Road repair activity. Under this alternative, Road repairs would be made without substantial pre-planning or design. There are no assurances that the Road would not fail, triggering a major, unexpected closure. Current visitor counts already incorporate this level of visitor interruption.

2. Priority Rehabilitations. This alternative differs from the Repair as Needed alternative in three ways: 1) the amount of annual expenditures is higher, about \$5 million per year; 2) planning and design of the work is conducted ahead of time; and 3) the historical, cultural, environmental, socioeconomic, and long-term maintenance considerations are addressed in the planning and design. The construction season extends from mid-June to mid-October.

From the visitor's perspective, the types of delays would be similar to Alternative 1. Visitor interruptions might not be as severe because pre-construction traffic management plans would have been prepared with the objective of minimizing visitor inconvenience. Also, preplanning will enable the community to know ahead of time when and where delays would occur. The higher volume of rehabilitation work counterbalances these positive effects.

3. Comprehensive Shared Use. This is the Road rehabilitation alternative for which the base cost and schedule estimates were generated. Using this alternative, designs for all rehabilitation sites would be prepared in concert with historical, cultural, environmental, socioeconomic, and long-term maintenance considerations. While the designs are underway, an overall traffic management plan would be developed, addressing the overall visitor impact. Construction work would occur between mid-June and mid-October.

From the visitor's perspective, there would be minimal interference with two-way traffic on the Road during peak visitor hours, weekends, and holidays, other than possible five-minute delays. Traffic delays of up to 30 minutes would occur on the shoulders of peak weekdays. Traffic delays of up to four hours could be scheduled at night during weekdays.

4. Extended Rehabilitation Season. This strategy builds on Alternative 3 by extending the time the Road is under construction but closed to visitors. The Road would be open to visitors during a slightly shortened season, July 1 through October 1. The construction season would extend from June 15 through November 1, weather permitting. Alternative 4 has all of the same considerations and attributes as Alternative 3, but requires fewer years because construction activity is unhampered by visitors for about five weeks each year.

During the shortened time in which the Road is open to visitors, travel delays would be identical to Alternative 3. There would be minimal interference with traffic on the Road during peak visitor hours, weekends, and holidays, except possible five-minute delays. Traffic delays of up to 30 minutes would occur on the shoulders of peak weekdays. Traffic delays of up to four hours could be scheduled at night during weekdays. There would be no days during the shortened visitor period in which the Road is closed to visitors.

5. Road Segment Closures. The initial approach is the same as Alternative 3, in that designs for all rehabilitation sites would be prepared in concert with historical, cultural, environmental, socioeconomic and long-term maintenance considerations. While the designs are underway, an overall Road segment closure plan would be developed. The construction season would extend from mid-June through mid-October.

Segments of the Road would be closed to visitors throughout the season during the rehabilitation effort, excluding weekends. This is the only alternative that includes Road segment closure(s).

Construction Schedules and Costs

Alternative 1, Repair As Needed, assumes an annual funding level of \$2 million, which is similar to current levels; this alternative will take about fifty years to complete. Alternative 2, Priority Rehabilitations, assumes an annual funding level of \$5,000,000 and will take about twenty years to complete. (All figures are in constant 2001, non-inflated dollars.)

Alternatives 3, 4 and 5 would commit significantly more funding each year; these will take from six to ten years to complete, depending on the alternative. Alternative 3, Comprehensive Shared Use, will take between eight and nine years; this analysis assumes nine years. Alternative 4, Extended Rehabilitation Season, will take seven to eight years; this analysis assumes eight years. Alternative 5, Road Segment Closures, will take six to seven years; this analysis assumes seven years.

For Alternatives 3 through 5, the earliest year that construction would begin is estimated to be 2004, since it will take time to complete the environmental studies, allow for proper review, and complete the engineering analysis, the construction bid process, and pre-construction management tasks. For comparative purposes, this analysis assumes that Alternative 1, Repair As Needed, and Alternative 2, Priority Rehabilitations, also begin in 2004. From a practical perspective, Alternative 1 continues each year and Alternative 2 could begin earlier than 2004.

As described in the table below, Alternative 5, Road Segment Closures, is estimated to cost the least, \$72.2 million, because there is a relatively greater opportunity to employ time-effective and cost-effective construction techniques. Alternative 1, Repair As Needed, costs the most, \$98.0 million in constant 2001 dollars, because pre-planning is not possible and many cost-effective construction techniques are not applicable. If an inflation adjustment were added, Alternative 1 would cost substantially more because it extends over 50 years. Estimated costs for these and other alternatives are summarized in the table below.

**Table 17: Estimated Construction Schedule and Costs
for Road Rehabilitation Alternatives**

Alternatives	Years	Construction Schedule	Costs (Millions of Constant \$)
1. Repair as Needed	~50	2004 through 2052	\$98.0
2. Priority Rehabilitations	~20	2004 through 2021	\$90.0
3. Comprehensive Shared Use	9	2004 through 2012	\$81.4
4. Extended Rehabilitation Season	8	2004 through 2011	\$90.2
5. Road Segment Closures	7	2004 through 2010	\$72.2

For Alternatives 3 and 5, construction activity is assumed to take place between mid-June and mid-October of each construction year, a four-month period. For Alternative 4, construction activity is extended between May and mid-November of each construction year, a 6.5-month period. Construction activity is also concentrated heavily in June and October, when the Road is closed to visitors.

Summary Results

Visitor expenditures associated with the Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 5 are presented in the summary tables below. Alternative 2, Priority Rehabilitations, is not analyzed because, from a visitor perspective, it cannot be distinguished from Alternative 1 at this time.

Note: *In the analysis below, visitor impacts associated with Alternatives 3, 4, and 5 are compared with Alternative 1, which is similar to a continuation of current funding levels and Road maintenance practices.*

All dollar calculations are in constant U.S. dollars. There is no adjustment for inflation and no adjustment for the Canadian/U.S. exchange rate. Inflation may become a sensitivity variable in the forthcoming environmental impact analysis. Year-by-year expenditures for these alternatives appear in a series of tables at the end of the chapter.

These figures are forecasted direct expenditures made by visitors to Glacier National Park, which have been distributed to the three Montana counties in the local impact

area (Flathead, Glacier, and Lake), the portion of southwest Alberta that is in the local impact area, and the remainder of Montana. These calculations have been derived using the ten-step process described in the next section.

The forthcoming environmental impact analysis will place these figures into context by providing total expenditures in each local impact area and describing the share of the total represented by visitors to Glacier National Park.

Alternative 3: (2004-2012) Over 9 Years In Local Impact Area	
Alt 1: Visitors During Construction:	13,858,546
Alt 1: Visitor Expenditures	\$1,428,761,000
Alt. 3: Visitor Reduction	(1,902,501)
Alt. 3: Expenditure Reduction	(\$190,847,000)

Alternative 3, Comprehensive Shared Use. This alternative has the lowest reduction in visitors and visitor expenditures when measured in absolute figures. Within the local impact area, visitors are estimated to be 1.9 million fewer, and visitor expenditures \$191.0 million lower in constant year 2000 dollars over the nine-year construction schedule, relative to Alternative 1.

As described in the summary table below the percentage impact in each local area is similar (13.3% to 13.8% reduction); the percentage impact differs depending on the proportion of Out-of-State, Canadian, and Non-Local Montanan visitors that each area attracts. Different types of visitors spend different amounts of money per day. The dollar volume of impact differs, depending on the size of the local economy and its ability to attract visitor expenditures. In the remainder of Montana, this alternative would trigger a \$172.1 million reduction in visitor expenditures, which represents a fourteen percent reduction from Alternative 1.

Table 18: Direct Visitor Expenditure Impact, Alternative 3, Over 9 Years
(Expressed in Thousands of Constant Year 2000 Dollars)

	Flathead County	Glacier County	Lake County	Alberta, Canada	Total Local Impact	Remainder of Montana
Alt 3 Expenditures	\$996,846	\$170,679	\$216,319	\$44,917	\$1,428,761	\$1,231,496
Expenditure Reduction	(\$132,864)	(\$23,540)	(\$28,303)	(\$6,140)	(\$190,847)	(\$172,002)
% Reduction	-13.3%	-13.8%	-13.1%	-13.7%	-13.4%	-14.0%

Alternative 4, Extended Rehabilitation Season. This alternative has the second lowest reduction in visitors and visitor expenditures. It extends for one less year than Alternative 3. The amount of impact in each construction year is greater than Alternative 3 because this alternative includes a shortened period of time (July through September) during which visitors may travel on Going-to-the-Sun Road and there is an anticipated negative visitor response to this condition.

Within the local impact area, visitors are estimated to be 2.15 million fewer and visitor expenditures \$216.9 million lower (in constant year 2000 dollars) during Road rehabilitation under this alternative relative to Alternative 1. Over the eight-year construction schedule, this reflects a 17.1 percent reduction in visitor expenditures.

As described in the summary table below, the percentage impact in each local impact area is similar (16.7% to 17.6% reduction); the percentage impact differs depending on the proportion of Out-of-State, Canadian, and Non-Local Montanan visitors that each area attracts. The dollar volume of impact is different, depending on the size of the local economy and its ability to attract visitor expenditures.

**Alternative 4 (2004-20012)
Over 8 Years
Local Impact Area**

Alt 1: Visitors During Construction:	12,316,225
Alt 1: Visitor Expenditures	\$1,269,754,000
Alt. 4: Visitor Reduction	(2,149,921)
Alt. 4: Expenditure Reduction	(\$216,888,000)

In the remainder of Montana, this alternative would trigger a \$196.3 million reduction in visitor expenditures, which represents a 17.9 percent reduction over the eight-year construction schedule.

Table 19: Direct Visitor Expenditure Impact, Alternative 4, Over 8 Years
(Expressed in Thousands of Constant Year 2000 Dollars)

	Flathead County	Glacier County	Lake County	Alberta, Canada	Total Local Impact	Remainder of Montana
Alt 4 Expenditures	\$885,907	\$151,684	\$192,245	\$39,918	\$1,269,754	\$1,094,443
Expenditure Reduction	(\$151,080)	(\$26,726)	(\$32,149)	(\$6,933)	(\$216,888)	(\$196,270)
% Reduction	-17.1%	-17.6%	-16.7%	-17.4%	-17.1%	-17.9%

**Alternative 5 (2004-2010)
Over 7 Years
Local Impact Area**

Alt 1: Visitors During Construction:	10,773,910
Alt 1: Visitor Expenditures	\$1,110,747,000
Alt. 5: Visitor Reduction	(2,651,841)
Alt. 5: Expenditures Reductions	(\$280,206,000)

Alternative 5, Road Segment

Closures. This alternative triggers the highest negative impact when measured in reductions in visitors and visitor expenditures from an absolute and a percentage perspective.

Although it would take fewer years to complete (seven years), it would generate a 25 percent reduction in visitors and visitor expenditures relative to Alternative 1. The relatively significant

impact is because this is the only alternative that includes Road segment closures and anticipated visitor response to this condition is more negative than anticipated response to traffic delays.

Over seven years, Alternative 5 triggers an estimated reduction of 2.7 million visitors and an estimated reduction of \$280.2 million in visitor expenditures within the local impact area. It also triggers an estimated \$258.2 million reduction in visitors in the remainder of Montana.

Table 20: Direct Visitor Expenditure Impact, Alternative 5, Over 7 Years
(Expressed in Thousands of Constant Year 2000 Dollars)

	Flathead County	Glacier County	Lake County	Alberta, Canada	Total Local Impact	Remainder of Montana
Alt 5 Expenditures	\$774,968	\$132,689	\$168,171	\$34,919	\$1,110,747	\$957,390
Expenditure Reduction	(\$195,219)	(\$34,836)	(\$40,873)	(\$9,278)	(\$280,206)	(\$258,177)
% Reduction	-25.2%	-26.3%	-24.3%	-26.6%	-25.2%	-27.0%

Sources of Visitor Expenditure Reduction. This methodology estimates visitor expenditure reductions by the visitor's residence because trip and expenditure characteristics differ among visitors depending, in part, on their travel origin. The analysis provides calculations for four of visitors:

- Out-of-State Visitors, which include all visitors except Canadians and Montanans, (72.8%);
- Canadians, which include all visitors with a Canadian residence (6.8%);
- Non-Local Montanans, which includes all Montanans except those residing in the three local impact counties, (11.2%), and;
- Local Montanans, which include residents of Flathead, Glacier and Lake counties (9.2%).

Expenditures for all four types of visitors are estimated for Alternative 1, which is similar to a continuation of current visitor interruption and Road maintenance practices. The visitor expenditure reductions associated with Road rehabilitation alternatives 3, 4, and 5 include expenditures for three types of visitors (Out-Of-State, Canadians and Non-Local Montanans). The working assumption is that with construction activity on Going-to-the-Sun Road, Local Montanans might visit the park fewer times but continue to spend money locally; therefore, they should not be reflected in reduced expenditure calculations.

Step-by-Step Methodology

The methodology is summarized in text format below and is illustrated in the spreadsheets in Appendix H. The spreadsheets contain labels for each step so the reader can follow the calculations.

- Step 1: Estimate the number of visitor days by month – Alternative 1.** Alternative 1 is used as an approximation of current trends and current level of visitor interruption due to Going-to-the-Sun Road maintenance. Annual visitor forecasts have been prepared by Dr. Thomas Obremski and are presented in detail in Chapter 5. This analysis assumes that distribution of visitors by month will be comparable to the average distribution of visitors by month for the five-year period, 1995 through 1999. The year 2000 has not been used because of the potential disturbance in visitation patterns due to the forest fires elsewhere in Montana. The percent of monthly visitors for each month of the construction season are summarized below.

Table 21: Percent of Total Glacier National Park Visitors - Construction Season

May	June	July	August	September	October	November
5.0%	13.8%	30.1%	28.7%	15.2%	3.1%	0.6%

For Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5 the 4.0-month construction season (mid-June through mid-October) includes 82.4 percent of total annual visitors.

For Alternative 4, the 6.5-month construction season (May through mid-November) includes 96.2 percent of total annual visitors.

- Step 2: Estimate Visitors by Origin.** The proportion of visitors from different origins or places of residence are estimated individually because their travel and expenditure patterns differ from one another. Four categories of visitors are applied in this analysis:
- “Out-of-State” Visitors, which include all visitors except for those from Montana and Canada; *Note that Canadians are not included in this category even though they are literally from out-of-state. Canadians are treated separately because the data shows that Canadians’ travel patterns are not similar to other out-of-state travelers.*
 - Canadians, which include all visitors whose residence is Canada;
 - Non-Local Montanans, which include all Montanans except those from Flathead, Glacier, or Lake counties;
 - Local Montanans, which include all Montanans from Flathead, Glacier and Lake Counties.

The data source for this step is the 2000 Survey of Visitors. This data is generally comparable with other prior surveys with respect to the origin of visitors.

- Step 3: Estimate Reduction in Visitor Days by Month -- Road Rehabilitation Alternatives.** For each road rehabilitation alternative, estimates have been prepared for the reduction in visitor days from Alternative 1 for the number of years that the Road is under construction. These estimates are based on results from the 2000 Survey of Visitors and on judgment related to the amount and intensity of traffic disruption. Using the results of the 2000 Survey of Visitors, rather than the 2001 Survey of Potential Visitors, produces higher estimated reductions in visitor days. These figures are presented as a reduction from Alternative 1, where road maintenance practices are expected to be similar to current practices.

Table 22: Visitor Impact from Road Rehabilitation Alternatives

Road Rehab Alternative	Years	Percentage Reduction in Visitors				
		Overall	Out-of-State	Canadian	Non-Local Montanans	Local Montanans
3	9	(14%)	(14%)	(13%)	(13%)	(13%)
4	8	(18%)	(18%)	(16%)	(16%)	(16%)
5	7	(25%)	(27%)	(26%)	(17%)	(17%)

Source: Washington Infrastructure Services, 2000 Survey of Visitors

Step 4: Estimate Average Daily Expenditures Per Person Per Visitor Category. The 2000 Survey of Visitors asked visitors to estimate their daily travel group expenditures for seven categories of goods and services and asked for the number of people traveling in the group. By cross-tabulating responses, travel expenditures per person were calculated for the four visitor categories: Out-of-State, Canadians, Non-Local Montanans, and Local Montanans.

Estimated average daily expenditures per person are as follows: Out-of-State: \$118; Canadians, \$87, Non-Local Montanans: \$67; Local Montanans: \$41. In this report, estimated average daily expenditures are in Year 2000 dollars since this is the year in which the data was collected. The expenditures are not inflated to future year dollars. The forthcoming environmental impact statement may inflate expenditures to future year figures.

For each road rehabilitation alternative, “visitor” expenditures by local Montanans (residents of Flathead, Glacier and Lake Counties) are excluded. While the road is being rehabilitated, local residents won’t necessarily spend less money in the local area.

Step 5: Estimate Total Expenditures Per Month Incurred by Visitors to Glacier National Park. This is a direct mathematical calculation that applies estimated visitor days by origin by month (Step 3) times estimated average daily expenditures (Step 4).

Step 6: Estimate How Visitors Traveled to the Glacier National Park Area. The 2000 Survey of Visitors asked respondents what route they took to arrive in the Glacier National Park area and what route they took when leaving the Glacier National Park area. Responses to these questions are used to estimate the proportion of visitors that traveled through Flathead, Glacier and Lake Counties in Montana and southwest Alberta.

The responses regarding arrival and regarding departure routes are very similar; averages using responses to both questions are applied in these calculations.

In several instances, visitors travel through more than one portion of the local impact area to reach Glacier National Park. For example, visitors traveling through Lake County also travel through Flathead County to reach Glacier National Park. Similarly, visitors traveling from Canada and using US 89 also travel through Glacier County; visitors traveling from Canada and using US 93 also travel through Flathead County. These multiple-area travel paths were used; then, the figures were adjusted proportionately downward to 100 percent.

The result of this step is estimated visitor days traveling through Flathead, Glacier and Lake County and southwest Alberta on their way to the Glacier National Park area for each visitor category. These calculations do not imply that visitors stopped to spend money.

Step 7: Estimate Visitor Expenditure Capture Rates for Each Local Area. Some local communities are better able to capture the visitor expenditures than others because they are able to offer lodging, restaurants, travel services, gift shops, and recreation activities that visitors want and will stop to purchase. While Step 6 estimates visitors traveling through each local impact area, this step adjusts these figures by estimating the percent of the visitor's daily expenditures that local businesses will capture.

For this analysis, the following visitor expenditure capture rates are applied: Flathead County: 100%; Lake County; 60%; Glacier County and Alberta: 25%. These figures are based on judgment about the amount of visitor services and facilities available in each area. Unfortunately, we have no statistical foundation upon which to rely.

Step 8: Estimate the Proportion of Visitor Expenditures that Occur in Each Local Area. After adjusting for visitor expenditure capture rates (Step 7), expenditures for each local area are calculated for each visitor category. These figures represent the estimated proportion of total visitor expenditures that occurred in Flathead, Glacier, and Lake County and in Alberta.

Step 9: Estimate Monthly Visitor Expenditures in Each Local Area. This step applies the percentage distribution derived in Step 8 to the total daily visitor expenditures calculated in Step 5. The result is estimated visitor expenditures by month for each type of visitor in each local area.

Step 10: Estimate Visitor Expenditures Within Montana and Outside of the Local Impact Area. This step applies the estimated daily visitor expenditures for out-of-state visitors and Canadian visitors (Step 4) to the estimated number of days that these visitors plan to remain in Montana but outside of the local impact area on their travel trip.

Step 10, continued The number of days spent in the remainder of Montana is derived from questions in the visitor survey. Out-of-State visitors plan to spend an average of four days in the remainder of Montana; Canadian visitors plan to spend an average of one day in the remainder of Montana.

Appendix H provides an illustration of the step-by-step calculations for Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 5. Calculations for all other years are derived directly from changes in total visitors for each year. (Step 1, Line 1).

Construction Impacts. A breakdown of costs for labor, equipment and materials associated with each road rehabilitation alternative is summarized in the table that follows. Construction costs, measured in constant 2001 dollars, range between \$71.3 million and \$96.2 million. If costs were adjusted for inflation, then costs associated with Alternatives 1 and 2 would significantly higher due to their duration, fifty and twenty years respectively. Labor costs range between forty-seven and fifty percent of total costs; equipment ranges between twenty-three and twenty-six percent of total costs; materials range between twenty-six and twenty-seven percent of total costs.

**Table 23: Road Rehabilitation Alternatives: Construction Costs
(Constant 2001 Dollars)**

Alternative	Labor	Equipment	Materials	Total
1	\$45,800,000	\$25,500,000	\$26,400,000	\$97,700,000
2	\$42,600,000	\$23,400,000	\$23,500,000	\$89,500,000
3	\$40,000,000	\$19,800,000	\$21,600,000	\$81,400,000
4	\$44,300,000	\$21,900,000	\$24,000,000	\$90,200,000
5	\$35,700,000	\$17,400,000	\$19,100,000	\$72,200,000

The forthcoming environmental impact statement will incorporate an evaluation of the socioeconomic impacts from road construction activity, including but not limited to the following considerations:

- laborers and associated skill levels required by year;
- local labor pool availability and qualifications;
- seasonal labor and housing considerations;
- training opportunities;
- coincidence with other major road construction projects;
- volume of local spending and multiplier effects;
- construction worker housing needs and opportunities;
- capacity of Montana-based firms to accomplish construction tasks.

Table 24: Annual Visitors, Road Rehabilitation Alternatives

Year	Annual Visitors	Alternative 1	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
2004	1,855,000	1,531,582	-210,256	-267,353	-381,241
2005	1,861,000	1,536,534	-210,935	-268,217	-382,474
2006	1,864,000	1,539,012	-211,276	-268,650	-383,091
2007	1,866,000	1,540,663	-211,502	-268,938	-383,502
2008	1,867,000	1,541,489	-211,616	-269,082	-383,707
2009	1,868,000	1,542,315	-211,729	-269,227	-383,913
2010	1,868,000	1,542,315	-211,729	-269,227	-383,913
2011	1,868,000	1,542,315	-211,729	-269,227	0
2012	1,868,000	1,542,315	-211,729	0	0
Alt 3	16,785,000	13,858,540	-1,902,501	-2,419,148	-3,419,667
Alt 4	14,917,000	12,316,225	-1,690,772	-2,149,921	-3,035,754
Alt 5	13,049,000	10,773,910	-1,479,043	-1,880,694	-2,651,841

Table 25: Composite Direct Visitor Expenditures, Road Rehabilitation Expenditures
(Expressed in Thousands of Constant Year 2000 Dollars)

Year	Visitor Expenditures: Alt 1 (Base Case)	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 3	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 4	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 5
2004	\$157,900	- \$21,092	- \$26,971	-\$39,833
2005	\$158,410	-\$21,160	-\$27,058	-\$39,962
2006	\$158,666	-\$21,194	-\$27,102	-\$40,026
2007	\$158,836	- \$21,217	-\$27,131	-\$40,070
2008	\$158,921	- \$21,228	-\$26,145	-\$40,091
2009	\$159,007	- \$21,239	-\$27,160	-\$40,112
2010	\$159,007	- \$21,239	-\$27,160	-\$40,112
2011	\$159,007	- \$21,239	-\$27,160	0
2012	\$159,007	- \$21,239	0	0
Total	Alt 3: \$1,428,761 Alt 4: \$1,269,754 Alt 5: \$1,110,747	- \$190,847 -13.4%	-\$216,888 -17.1%	-\$280,206 -25.2%

**Table 26: Flathead County, Direct Visitor Expenditures,
Road Rehabilitation Alternatives**
(Expressed in Thousands of Constant Year 2000 Dollars)

Year	Visitor Expenditures: Alt 1 (Base Case)	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 3	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 4	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 5
2004	\$110,167	- \$14,684	- \$18,788	-\$27,752
2005	\$110,523	-\$14,731	-\$18,848	-\$27,842
2006	\$110,701	-\$14,755	-\$18,879	-\$27,886
2007	\$110,820	-\$14,771	-\$18,899	-\$27,916
2008	\$110,879	-\$14,779	-\$18,909	-\$27,931
2009	\$110,939	-\$14,786	-\$18,919	-\$27,946

**Table 26: Flathead County, Direct Visitor Expenditures,
Road Rehabilitation Alternatives (Continued)**

(Expressed in Thousands of Constant Year 2000 Dollars)

Year	Visitor Expenditures: Alt 1 (Base Case)	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 3	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 4	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 5
2010	\$110,939	- \$14,786	-\$18,919	-\$27,946
2011	Alt 3 & 4: \$110,939	- \$14,786	-\$18,919	0
2012	Alt 3: \$110,939	- \$14,786	0	0
Total	Alt 3: \$996,846 Alt 4: \$885,907 Alt 5: \$774,968	-\$132,864 -13.3%	-\$151,080 -17.1%	-\$195,219 -25.2%

**Table 27: Glacier County Direct Visitor Expenditures,
Road Rehabilitation Alternatives**

(Expressed in Thousands of Constant Year 2000 Dollars)

Year	Visitor Expenditures: Alt 1. (Base Case)	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 3	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 4	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 5
2004	\$18,862	- \$2,601	-\$3,323	-\$4,952
2005	\$18,923	-\$2,610	-\$3,334	-\$4,968
2006	\$18,954	-\$2,614	-\$3,340	-\$4,976
2007	\$18,975	-\$2,617	-\$3,343	-\$4,982
2008	\$18,985	-\$2,618	-\$3,345	-\$4,984
2009	\$18,995	-\$2,620	-\$3,347	-\$4,987
2010	\$18,995	-\$2,620	-\$3,347	-\$4,987
2011	Alts 3 & 4: \$18,995	-\$2,620	-\$3,347	0
2012	Alt 3: \$18,995	-\$2,620	0	0
Total	Alt 3: \$170,679 Alt 4: \$151,684 Alt 5: \$132,689	-\$23,540 -13.8%	- \$26,726 -17.6%	- \$34,836 -26.3%

**Table 28: Lake County, Direct Visitor Expenditures
Road Rehabilitation Alternatives**

(Expressed in Thousands of Constant Year 2000 Dollars)

Year	Visitor Expenditures: Alt 1 (Base Case)	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 3	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 4	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 5
2004	\$23,906	- \$3,128	-\$3,998	-\$5,810
2005	\$23,984	-\$3,138	-\$4,011	-\$5,829
2006	\$24,023	-\$3,143	-\$4,017	-\$5,839
2007	\$24,048	- \$3,146	-\$4,021	-\$5,845
2008	\$24,061	- \$3,148	-\$4,024	-\$5,848
2009	\$24,074	-\$3,150	-\$4,026	-\$5,851
2010	\$24,074	- \$3,150	-\$4,026	-\$5,851
2011	Alt 3 & 4: \$24,074	- \$3,150	-\$4,026	0
2012	Alt 3: \$24,074	- \$3,150	0	0
Total	Alt 3: \$216,319 Alt 4: \$192,245 Alt 5: \$168,171	- \$28,303 -13.1%	-\$32,149 -16.7%	- \$40,873 -24.2%

**Table 29: Southwest Alberta Direct Visitor Expenditures,
Road Rehabilitation Alternatives**

(Expressed in Thousands of Constant Year 2000 Dollars)

Year	Visitor Expenditures: Alt 1 (Base Case)	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 3	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 4	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 5
2004	\$4,965	-\$679	- \$862	-\$1,319
2005	\$4,980	-\$681	-\$865	-\$1,323
2006	\$4,988	-\$682	-\$867	-\$1,325
2007	\$4,993	-\$683	-\$867	-\$1,327
2008	\$4,996	-\$683	-\$868	-\$1,328
2009	\$4,999	-\$683	-\$868	-\$1,328

Table 29: Southwest Alberta Direct Visitor Expenditures, Road Rehabilitation Alternatives

(Expressed in Thousands of Constant Year 2000 Dollars)

Year	Visitor Expenditures: Alt 1 (Base Case)	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 3	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 4	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 5
2010	\$4,999	-\$683	-\$868	-\$1,328
2011	Alt 3 & 4: \$4,999	-\$683	-\$868	0
2012	Alt 3: \$4,999	-\$ 683	0	0
Total	Alt 3: \$44,917 Alt 4: \$39,918 Alt 5: \$34,919	- \$6,140 - 13.7%	-\$6,933 -17.4%	-\$9,278 -26.6%

Table 30: Remainder of Montana, Direct Visitor Expenditures, Road Rehabilitation Alternatives *(Expressed in Thousands of Constant Year 2000 Dollars)*

Year	Visitor Expenditures: Alt 1 (Base Case)	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 3	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 4	Visitor Expenditure Reduction: Alternative 5
2004	\$136,099	- \$19,009	- \$24,407	-\$36,702
2005	\$136,539	-\$19,071	-\$24,486	-\$36,820
2006	\$136,760	-\$19,101	-\$24,526	-\$36,879
2007	\$136,906	- \$19,121	-\$24,552	-\$36,919
2008	\$136,980	- \$19,132	-\$24,565	-\$36,939
2009	\$137,053	- \$19,142	-\$24,578	- \$36,959
2010	\$137,053	- \$19,142	-\$24,578	-\$36,959
2011	Alt. 3 & 4: \$137,053	- \$19,142	-\$24,578	0
2012	Alt. 3: \$137,053	- \$19,142	0	0
Total	Alt 3: \$1,231,496 Alt 4: \$1,094,443 Alt 5: \$ 957,390	- \$172,002 -14.0%	- \$196,270 -17.9%	- \$258,177 -27.0%